

Appln. No.: 10/727,763  
Amendment Dated April 13, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of January 26, 2005

TN322

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet(s) of drawings include(s) changes to Figures 2, 3, 6, 8. These sheets replace the original sheets.

Attachments

**Remarks/Arguments:**

The pending claims are 1-4, 6-19. Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 5, 15, and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5 and 20 have been canceled. Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 11-14, and 17 have been amended. No new matter is introduced therein.

Various aspects of the drawings have been objected to. Since Figures 2, 3, 6, and 8 have been amended, applicants request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

The specification has been objected to because of an informality. Since the specification has been amended, applicants request that the objection be withdrawn. The specification has also been amended so that it is consistent with the amendments to the drawings. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

Claims 7, 8, 11, and 17 have been objected to because of various informalities. Since these claims have been amended, applicants request that these objections be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 8-16, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Since claims 4, 8, 12-14, and 20 have been amended, applicants request that the rejections be withdrawn. The amendments have not introduced new matter.

Claims 1, 3, 8-14, 17, 18, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Miller, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 3,059,986). Claims 1-4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Kofstad (U.S. Patent No. 5,833,337). Since the Office Action has indicated that claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten, claim 1 has been amended by reciting the features in claim 5. Claim 5 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter therein. Accordingly, amended claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Since claims 2-4, 6 and 7 depend from allowable claim 1, as amended, those claims are also now in condition for allowance. Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kofstad in view of Hooker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,225,265). This rejection is now moot because claim 7 depends from allowable claim 1, as amended.

The rejection of claim 8 is respectfully traversed. Claim 8 recites, in part:

an extension coupled to the support, the extension having a portion moveable with respect to the support between a first position preventing sliding of the rail with respect to the support and a second portion permitting sliding of the rail with respect to the support.

The Office Action contends that support 25 in Miller has a support and an extension as defined by claim 8. Applicants respectfully disagree. In support of the rejection, page 8 of the Office Action contends that Miller discloses a "first support (25) having an extension extending into the recess of the first mounting portion of the rail and allowing sliding of the first mounting portion of the rail relative to the first support." In Miller, the rail 25 has a tongue 26 (see, e.g., Figure 9; col. 2, lines 40-42). However, this interpretation of Miller in the Office Action does not support a rejection of claim 8.

Claim 8 more specifically recites "a support" and "an extension coupled to the support." In addition, claim 8 recites that the extension has "a portion moveable with respect to the support." Tongue 26 in Miller is not "moveable with respect to" support 25. Instead, tongue 26 is part of support 25 and moves along with support 25. Accordingly, claim 8 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Miller. Since claims 9-16 depend from claim 8, they are also not subject to rejection for at least the same reasons. Although the Office Action has indicated that claims 15 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten, they have not been rewritten because applicants believe that claim 8 is allowable.


In addition to the rejection of claims 17, 18, and 20 as anticipated by Miller, those claims have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Kofstad. Claim 17 has been amended by incorporating the features of claim 20. Claim 17 has also been amended by referring to the extension recited in line 4 of claim 17 as "a first extension" and the extension that had previously been recited in claim 20 has been amended as "a second extension." Amended claim 17 now recites two extensions. In addition, amended claim 17 recites that the second extension is moved to prevent sliding of the rail. The Office Action concedes that both Miller and Kofstad only disclose one extension. The second extension is analogous to the extension recited in claim 8. Accordingly, amended claim 17 is not subject to rejection for the reasons stated with respect to the rejection of claim 8.

Appln. No.: 10/727,763  
Amendment Dated April 13, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of January 26, 2005

TN322

For all of the above reasons, applicants solicit allowance of claims 1-4 and 6-19.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joshua L. Cohen, Reg. No. 38,040  
Stanley Weinberg, Reg. No. 25,276  
Attorneys for Applicants

SW/pb/ap

Attachments: Figures 2, 3, 6, 8 (3 sheets)


Dated: April 13, 2005

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby  
authorized to charge payment to Deposit  
Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated  
with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited  
with the United States Postal Service as first class mail,  
with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA  
22313-1450 on:

PCB\_I:\UNS\455US\AMEND01.DOC

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joshua L. Cohen